



Woodford Neighbourhood Forum

c/o Woodford Community Centre, Chester Road, Woodford, Stockport, Cheshire, SK7 1PS
Email: woodfordneighbourhood@gmail.com Web: www.woodfordneighbourhoodforum.co.uk

Meeting between Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) and Woodford Neighbourhood Forum (WNF) to discuss Draft Policy issues in Woodford's proposed Neighbourhood Plan

Thursday 11th May 2017 at Woodford Community Centre Small Hall, 2.30pm

NOTES

	Action
Attendance WNF: Roger Burton (RB), John Knight (JK), Evelyn Frearson (EF), Jude Craig (JC) SMBC: David Johnston (DJ), Steve Johnson (SJ)	
1. Welcome RB opened the meeting and welcomed SMBC officers.	
2. Agenda This was reviewed and agreed.	
3. Approval of minutes The minutes of the meeting held on 6 th April 2017 were approved.	
4. WNF progress against national planning guidance (NPG): DJ had circulated a note outlining progress with the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan against the NPG. This had been reviewed by WNF plan group. JK led the discussion. 4.a Consultation with landowners WNF agreed that with DJ's notes. WNF is currently at NPG Step 2. WNF had not contacted landowners because the neighbourhood plan will not allocate sites. SJ noted that some landowners may wish to allocate sites. WNF needs to identify the issues in Woodford, one of these being that it is in Green Belt. WNF needs to engage with landowners and explain to any who want to allocate site why we are not allocating. WNF team explained that WNF has included landowners in consultation. SMBC team explained that the development industry tends to rely on formal consultations, such as regulation 14 (Pre-submission Consultation). Action: SJ advised WNF to consider this issue and be happy that it was covered. Action WNF to think about it.	WNF

<p>4.b Options WNF team noted that the major constraint was the fact that Woodford is in Green Belt, which limits options. Action: SMBC team advised WNF to look at the draft plan, consider what other options there were and explain why these had not been pursued.</p> <p>4.c Conditions statement This will be written up by WNF later this year</p> <p>4.d Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) JK explained that WNF had not identified to date any special sites in Woodford. If an SEA isn't needed, WNF has to explain why. SMBC team advised that there were pros and cons to not allocating sites and to discuss with Angie Dukes. Action: SMBC team advised WNF to speak to Angie Dukes of SMBC.</p> <p>4.e Step 3 of NPG JK agreed that WNF have not yet started on this stage.</p>	<p>WNF</p> <p>Deferred</p> <p>WNF</p>
<p>5. Supply of evidence by WNF to SMBC There was in depth discussion about the best way to present the policies and the evidence and justification residents and to SMBC and the best way to structure the Pre-Submission Consultation document.</p> <p>It was concluded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - language should be aimed at the layperson rather than planners - it could be tested on residents who are not on the committee and not planners - justification was best presented with the policies to save the reader flicking from one place to another - references were best presented in a separate location and given a unique reference number which was used though-out the document - footnotes in the policy section could refer the reader to the reference section - a degree of flexibility would be acceptable as there were differences in the best approach for different sections - SMBC would prefer to receive all the evidence as a block when it is all assembled and the policies are finalised <p>Action WNF to prepare the document as above</p>	<p>WNF</p>
<p>6. Consultation database JK enquired whether SMBC have a list of consultees. The SMBC team explained that they have a list of 1,500 consultees and use letter and email. There is cost involved which will be WNF's responsibility at Step 3. Action SMBC team to report back to WNF regard the list of consultees</p>	<p>SMBC</p>

<p>7. Approval of policies edited to date ENV policies were approved. COM policies were approved. EMP policies were discussed.</p> <p>The WNF had a number of questions regarding EMP policies. Regarding EMP2 and SMBC AE-6, which ask for evidence that the employment use is no longer viable, the SMBC team explained that they ask for marketing evidence that it is not a viable proposition to continue the business. The criteria are not prescriptive, e.g. it could include maintenance of the premises being prohibitively expensive.</p> <p>Regarding EMP4, the WNF team asked whether this should be deleted as it simply repeats NPPF and, as it refers to design, could be covered in principle under Development policies. It was agreed to delete it from Employment</p> <p>Action WNF team to edit EMP policies as above</p>	WNF
<p>8. Further policy review</p>	
<p>Village action plan RB explained that some of our “policies” were aspirational and the intention was to have a separate section for these. For example, this would include Integration.</p>	
<p>8.a Sustainability RB explained that this was a short section with three policies, which were written when government sustainability initiatives were being watered down, with the aim of giving a lead. However, consultation had not revealed much interest in Woodford. SUS1 policy is aspirational. SUS2 restates SMBC policy and SUS3 exists on new build anyway. Sustainable movement could be covered in the movement section.</p> <p>There was discussion about the way forward which included a possible conversation with Angie Duke, whether sustainability is under pressure due to costs to development, the potential effects of a new government, and potential changes in the NPPF. Air quality was identified as a key issue which may continue to drive sustainability initiatives and will impact on where development can be located.</p> <p>The SMBC team reported that the officers are keen on sustainable development.</p> <p>The SEMMMS refresh study is being undertaken by Atkins, jointly commissioned by SMBC and CEC. It will look at the impacts and how can they be mitigated. A consultation is expected, possibly at the same time as time as the SMBC Local Plan consultation.</p> <p>Action WNF team to consider whether the sustainability section is redundant</p>	WNF

<p>8.b Movement</p> <p>RB explained that this section is aspirational.</p> <p>The SMBC team noted that it is difficult to say that developers will be required to contribute. The WNF justification is that we have identified where there is a problem. WNF could have a policy on it but would need to have a way in which it could be applied. The aspirations could be used as scene setting for the plan.</p> <p>A potential policy would be: Developers would be expected to contribute to improving footpaths etc.</p> <p>WNF observed that we may need two lists. One would be projects for WNF to raise funds. The other would be projects to request SMBC to take up</p> <p>Action SMBC team advised WNF to speak to the Highways Authority, starting with Nick Wheelan, who will know who to contact.</p>	
<p>8.c Development</p> <p>DJ reported that he had made a start on drawing a Woodford village boundary. He noted that the NPPF doesn't require a village boundary. He had looked at other village boundaries as examples, and taken one from Wellingborough.</p> <p>There was extensive discussion. The SMBC team noted that it is highly sensitive, but the land within the village boundary stays within Green Belt. One inspector defined Woodford as a village during an appeal on 368 Chester Road. Accessibility and sustainability are issues in these sorts of cases. SMBC lost this case and the arguments included that Redrow would have shops and it had access to Poynton station. DJ noted that it will be a big piece of work to complete.</p> <p>The WNF team suggested that maybe DEV policies should on hold. The SMBC team queried why the drawing of a village boundary should necessarily impact on the wording of the policies, and we could consider proceeding.</p> <p>Action WNF to discuss implications, pros and cons.</p>	
<p>Timescales</p> <p>The SMBC team explained that they don't want to undertake the Neighbourhood Plan consultation at same time as the Local Plan (LP) and GMSF. LP consultation commences Fri 28th July to 7th Oct. GMSF timing is less certain. We now have new mayor who made an announcement, reiterating what he said before, that he is looking for radical rewrite. He has appointed the current mayor of Salford to oversee it. The next consultation is likely to be later than Sep.</p> <p>Therefore, there is an opportunity for NP consultation in the autumn.</p> <p>Action WNF team to work towards Pre-Submission consultation in autumn 2017.</p>	
<p>AOB</p> <p>A6 MARR road works expected to continue into 2018.</p>	

<p>SMBC Local Plan Consultation</p> <p>The SMBC explained that they will have LP events as stand-alone events. They would like WNF to be a formal part of the consultation because we are a Forum. They will come and talk to us as a body about the LP. The WNF team suggested possible group structures, including WNF main committee, Forum members, AGM audience (after the AGM itself).</p> <p>Action</p> <p>WNF committee to discuss and report back to SMBC.</p>	
<p>Next meeting</p> <p>To be arranged if and when needed.</p>	

Evelyn Frearson 12th May 2017